

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/722,537 | LIU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Emmanuel Sayoc | 3746 | |

All Participants:

(1) Emmanuel Sayoc.

(2) Bruce Troxell.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 January 2006

Time: 2pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 103a

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Van Depoele 461,295 and Tupper et al. 3,664,774


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Applicant agreed to the outlined examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)